

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

STATUS OF CLAIMS

In response to the Office Action dated April 10, 2007, claims 1-10 and 16-20 have been amended, and claims 11-15 have been canceled. Claims 1-10 and 16-20 are now pending in this application. No new matter has been added.

Claims 2-5, 7-10 and 17-20 have all been amended to being with “The” instead of “A”. Such claim amendments are non-narrowing claim amendments.

OBJECTION TO CLAIMS

Claims 14 and 19 have been objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.75(a). The Examiner contends that there is insufficient antecedent support for “the selecting means” at line 6.

The rejection is moot as to canceled claim 14, claim 19 being amended to depend from claim 16 and to change “the selecting means selects” to “in said selecting event,...” Claims 18-20 also have been amended to depend from claim 16. Therefore, withdrawal of the objection to claim 19, as amended, is respectfully solicited.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 11-15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Examiner contends that these claims define a program embodying functional descriptive material, but do not define a computer-readable medium or memory.

The rejection is moot as to canceled claims 11-15.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH

Claims 2, 7, 12 and 17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In support of this position, the Examiner maintains that there is insufficient antecedent support for “the tag information” in claims 2, lines 4-5, and in claims 7, 12 and 17.

By this Response, claims 2, 7, 12 and 17 have been amended to change “the tag information” to “tag information”. Therefore, claims 2, 7, 12 and 17, as amended, are believed to recite the invention with the degree of precision and particularity required by the statute. Therefore, it is respectfully urged that the rejection be withdrawn.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102 AND § 103

I. Claims 1, 6, 11 and 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Mizoguchi (U.S. Patent 5,805,215).

The rejection is moot as to canceled claim 11.

To expedite prosecution, independent claims 1, 6 and 16 have been amended to recite, *inter alia*:

... events, the events being organized by said each of a plurality of people;

Support for this subject matter is provided, for example, at page 9, lines 10-18 and Figure 2 of the present application.

There is a difference in what is recited in amended independent claims 1, 6 and 16 and what is disclosed in Mizoguchi. Both Mizoguchi and the present application disclose

schedule/event data in which events are associated with date/time and a plurality of people (col. 6, lines 22-37, Figs.4A, 4B and 4C of Mizoguchi / Page 9, lines 10-18, Fig.2 of the present application). However, Mizoguchi discloses schedule data in which *the events are organized by the events*, while in the present invention, *the events are organized by each of a plurality of people in the event database*. Therefore, claims 1, 6 and 16, as amended, are patentable over Mizoguchi and their allowance is respectfully solicited.

II. Claims 2, 7, 12 and 17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mizoguchi.

The rejection is moot as to canceled claim 12.

Claim 2 depends from amended claim, claim 7 depends from amended claim 6 and claim 17 depends from amended claim 16. Therefore, claims 2, 7 and 17 are patentable over Mizoguchi also, and their allowance is respectfully solicited.

III. Claims 3-5, 8-10, 13-15 and 18-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mizoguchi in view of Nakamura (U.S. Patent 7,009,643).

The rejection is moot as to canceled claims 13-15.

Nakamura does not remedy the deficiency of Mizoguchi, claims 3-5 depend from amended claim 1, claims 8-10 depend from amended claim 6 and claims 18-20 depend from amended claim 16.

Furthermore, Nakamura does not disclose or suggest the plurality of databases of claims 4, 9 and 19. Nakamura teaches a plurality of calendars, each of which contains one or more

events which are associated with date, time and a single person or a group, and the user is asked to select one calendar of a single person or a group (col. 4, lines 3-21 in Nakamura). Therefore, Nakamura's plurality of calendars, which contain the events of plurality of people, should correspond to one database in the present invention. That is, the plurality of databases in the present invention should correspond to a plurality of calendar groups, each of which contain a plurality of calendars, and the calendar groups are not disclosed nor suggested in Nakamura.

Furthermore, Nakamura does not teach or suggest that "a plurality of corresponding events are displayed in the case that a plurality of corresponding events, correlated with dates represented by the date data, are related to the plurality of people; selection of a single corresponding event from among the plurality of corresponding events is received", as recited in claims 5, 10 and 20. It is theoretically possible in both Nakamura and the present application that a plurality of events with the same date and time (but with different people) are stored in the database (calendars), but Nakamura always avoids such a case by selecting one calendar of a single person at an earlier step (col. 4, lines 3-21 in Nakamura). In contrast, in the present invention, the selection of the events only occurs when the plurality of events are selected from the database. In addition, when a plurality of events with the same date and time is selected from the database (calendars), Nakamura discloses refinement of the selection by using time or location information (col.4. lines 38-60 in Nakamura), but does not disclose nor suggest refinement by using the person.

Thus, claims 3-5, 8-10, 13-15 and 18-20 are patentable over Mizoguchi, even when considered in view of Nakamura. Therefore, the allowance of claims 3-5, 8-10, 13-15 and 18-20, as amended, is respectfully solicited.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendment, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Edward J. Wise (Reg. No. 34,523) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: October 9, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

#40,439

By 

Marc S. Weiner

Registration No.: 32,181

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant